REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1 and 3-11 will remain pending in the above-identified application and stand ready for further action on the merits.

The amendment made here into claim 1 does not incorporate new matter as originally filed. In this respect, claim 1 has simply been amended to incorporate limitations previously recited in claim 2 (now canceled).

Accordingly, the invention now recited in claim 1 has already been previously considered by the Examiner. Thus, the amendment does not raise new issues for the Examiner's consideration that would be improper after issuance of a Final Rejection.

Alternatively, entry of the present amendment, and proper consideration thereof, is appropriate at present since the amendment serves to put the claims into a better form for consideration by the Board of Appeals of the U.S. Patent Office and/or removes issues for consideration on appeal.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C.§112

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested based on the following considerations.

First, it is noted that claims 2 and 12-13 no longer are pending in the application. As such, any rejection of these claims has now been rendered moot.

Second, regarding remaining claims 1 and 3-11, these claims as instantly amended particularly and distinctly set forth the invention that the instant Inventors regard as their own. The statute requires no more. Accordingly, because the claims as instantly amended particularly and distinctly set forth the present invention being claimed, it follows that withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is required.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 09-224895 in view of JP 10-060761 and JP 2000-328415. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested based upon the following considerations.

The cleaning sheet according to claim 1 comprises a cleaning area comprising an air-laid nonwoven fabric and a low-friction area comprising a film or a nonwoven fabric. The cleaning area has a relatively high coefficient of static friction of 0.1 to 0.4, whereas the low-friction area has a relatively low coefficient of static friction of 0.01 to 1.0. None of the cited references teaches or suggests the subject matter of claim 1, even if two or more of the references are combined. The prior art rejections set forth in

the Office Action appear to be focused on claim 11, and no mention is made to claim 1.

Turning to the other independent claim, claim 11 is not rendered obvious over the combination of the three cited references for the following reasons. In the Office Action the USPTO asserts that the combination of JP '895 and JP '761 fails to teach the fineness of fibers being of 23 to 200 dtex. In order to cure the deficiencies of the combination of JP '895 and JP '761, JP '415 is further combined for the reason that JP '415 is classified under Int. Cl. A47L 13/16. However, there is no motivation for a skilled person in the art to combine JP '415 with JP '895 and JP '761. JP '415 discloses a nonwoven fabric made of short fibers, such as air-laid nonwoven fabric. The nonwoven fabric is characterized by its high rate of liquid permeation due to randomly laid short fibers. For this reason, JP '415 discloses that the nonwoven fabric is suitable for use as liquid-absorptive products such as disposable diapers for newborns and infants, sanitary napkin, bandages, pads for absorbing sweat, wipers for absorbing liquids and sheets for absorbing liquids. However, JP '415 is silent with regard to collecting dusts, which are present on a carpet. Accordingly, JP '415 belongs to a different technical field from JP '895 and JP '761. JP '415 merely discloses an air-laid nonwoven fabric containing fibers having a fineness of the claimed range. It is therefore concluded that there is no motivation to combine JP ' 415

with JP '895 and JP ' 761, and the subject matter of claim 11 is not rendered obvious over the three references.

Accordingly, based upon the above considerations, it is clear that none of the Applicants pending claims 1 and 3-11 are rendered obvious by the references cited. This is true whether such references are considered singularly or in combination.

Conclusion

Based upon the amendments and remarks presented herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to issue a Notice of Allowance clearly indicating that each of the pending claims 1 and 3-11 are allowed and patentable under the provisions of title 35 of the United States Code.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) respectfully petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of $110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
John W. Bailey, #32,881

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JWB/ndb
0445-0310P

Attachment(s)